

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks:

Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 22, 26 and 28 are cancelled.

Claims 29 and 30 are newly presented and are the independent claims.

Claims 31 and 32 are newly presented dependent claims.

Claims 4-13, 16-21, 23-25 and 27 have been amended.

No new matter has been added.

Drawings and Specification Objection

In response to the objection raised by the Office Action, Applicant amended the drawings by adding appropriate reference numerals to figures 1 and 3. Corresponding replacement sheets of the drawings (figure 1 and figure 3) are provided herein. Applicant further amended the specification to address the objections. In this regard, Applicant has added a description of Figure 3 to conform with the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that this description is fully supported by the application as filed (at least, for example, by as-filed Figure 3). Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render moot all of the Office Action objections to the drawings and the specification.

Section 101 Rejection

In response to the 101 Rejection aimed at claim 26, Applicant cancelled claim 26 thus rendering moot this rejection.

Section 112 Rejection

In response to the 112 Rejections, Applicant has amended the claims overcoming the rejections based on lack of antecedent basis and other deficiencies.

Section 102 Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19-20, 22-23 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Silva et al. (Silva, hereinafter), US Publication US2002/0054090.

In response to the Office Action, Applicant cancelled claims 1-3, 14, 15, 22, 26 and 28, rendering moot the above rejection in regards to the cancelled claims. Claims 29-32 are newly drafted claims presented for examination. Thus, claims 5, 7-8, 10, 12, 17, 19-20, 23 and 25 stand rejected. This rejection is respectfully traversed

Newly drafted independent claim 29 recites a method of identifying contextual location of a mobile device user within a content server over a cellular network. The method comprise *inter alia*: receiving user visited content from a content server, the content exhibiting embedded hyperlinks associated with corresponding titles and corresponding dynamic uniform resource locators (URL); parsing the received content and extracting the embedded hyperlinks and their corresponding titles and dynamic URLs, and storing the hyperlinks wherein each title is associated with its corresponding dynamic URL; upon receiving subsequent URL request, extracting corresponding hyperlink title from the previously stored hyperlink according to presently received URL; and creating a short term user surfing course comprising a sequence of hyperlink titles and the corresponding dynamic URLs; and

Silva discusses a system that enables a user to create a personalized Web view of content in a Web page for later access by users through diverse terminals having different types of processing and display capabilities. The Web view provides a shortcut to specific content and services, which a user is interested in retrieving through limited bandwidth, high latency "thin" devices such as PDAs and WAP phones. (Silva, Abstract). Silva further elaborates on the process of creating the personalized web view: "To create a Web view, a user first specifies the Web page to be clipped. If the page requires multiple steps in order to be retrieved and does not have a well-defined URL, the user can use the recorder component of the Web view applet to create the script to access the page. Using a VCR-style interface to transparently record browsing actions, a users can simply navigate his way to the final page while his actions (links traversed, forms filled along with the user inputs, and any other interactions with active content) are transparently recorded and saved in a smart bookmark" (Silva, paragraph 29).

The Office Action contends that Silva, by teaching the aforementioned smart bookmark which parses HTML pages and records browsing actions teaches either explicitly or implicitly all the features of the rejected claims (Office Action, pages 7-8).

Applicant respectfully submits that Silva does not meet the aforementioned features of newly presented independent claim 29. Specifically, Silva does not address the challenges necessitated by tracking the user's contextual location while browsing using dynamic URLs. Silva does not teach parsing the received content and extracting the embedded hyperlinks and their corresponding titles and dynamic URLs, and storing the hyperlinks wherein each title is associated with its corresponding dynamic URL. More specifically, Silva does not teach that upon receiving subsequent URL request, extracting corresponding hyperlink title from the previously stored hyperlink according to presently received URL. Further, creating a short term user surfing course comprising a sequence of hyperlink titles and the corresponding dynamic URLs is not taught by Silva. The claimed sequence differs from the trivial visited web pages sequence as it exhibits a linkage between dynamic hyperlink addresses (URLs) and their corresponding titles. Applicant submits that newly drafted claim 29 defined over Silva. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of independent claim 29.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 7-8, 10 and 12 are dependent from newly drafted claim 29. Therefore they also define over Silva by virtue of their dependencies.

Regarding newly drafted claim 30, similar arguments are respectfully submitted. Newly drafted claim 30 is the system embodiment of method claim 29 reciting all its limitation. New claim 30 teaches a content analysis module within a proxy server that is arranged *inter alia* to parse the received content and extract the embedded hyperlinks and their corresponding titles and dynamic URLs and store the hyperlinks wherein each title is associated with its corresponding dynamic URL; and upon receiving subsequent URL request, extract corresponding hyperlink title from the previously stored hyperlink according to presently received URL; and create a short term user surfing course comprising a sequence of user selected hyperlink titles and their corresponding dynamic URLs.

As explained above, Silva does not teach a content analysis module within a proxy server that is arranged to, upon receiving subsequent URL request, extract corresponding hyperlink title

from the previously stored hyperlink according to presently received URL extracting user selected embedded hyperlinks and their corresponding titles and dynamic URLs. Further, Silva does not teach creating a short term user surfing course comprising a sequence of hyperlink titles and the corresponding dynamic URLs. Thus, the system according to Silva is incapable of dealing with webpages exhibiting dynamic URLs in the manner described in new claim 30.

Therefore, Applicant submits that newly presented claim 30 defines over Silva. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17, 19-20, 23 and 25 are dependent from newly drafted claim 30. Therefore they also define over Silva by virtue of their dependencies.

Section 103 Rejections

The Office Action further rejected claims 4, 6,9,11,16,18,21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Wang et al. United States Patent 7039037 (hereinafter Wang).

The Office Action contends that as to claims 4 and 16, Silva teaches all the limitations except the limitation of access restriction to specific content according to content location. The Office further contends that Wang teaches these limitations. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Wang teaches a method in which WAP traffic is inspected with efficient algorithms to intercept un-registered WAP access and intercept dynamic change of user service selection. The intercepted WAP requests are modified with value-added parameters as per user and service provider agreement and table data (Abstract). Applicant submits that nowhere in Wang there is either suggestion or motivation to apply access restriction in accordance with contextual location driven from selected dynamic URLs. Rather, Wang merely implements predefined policy on WAP based browsing. Therefore, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to combine Silva with Wang.

The Office Action further rejected claims 9,11,21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silva in view of Hunzinger et al. United States Patent Application 200200062467 (hereinafter Hunzinger).

The Office Action contends that as to claims 9 and 21, Silva teaches all the limitations except the limitation of sampling the usage of the identified content location for providing usage statistical analysis. The Office further contends that Hunzinger teaches these limitations.

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Hunzinger teaches a system for identifying a user in access restricted content based mobile network. In the disclosed system a monitoring system may be used to keep track of the statistics of content delivery. To protect user privacy, devices or users may be identified with arbitrary identifiers which are associated with the appropriate device or user at the monitoring system, content provider, billing system, gateway, or other entity. Thus, Hunzinger merely teaches measures for secure transference of data over mobile networks and the internet. Hunzinger does not teach sampling of data for user behavioral analysis. Rather, the identification in Hunzinger pertains to the identity of the user and his or her credibility. Conversely, the claimed invention relates to identifying the contextual location of the user within the content server. Therefore, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to combine Silva with Hunzinger.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.

Applicant submits that this Amendment places this application in condition for allowance by amending claims in manners that are believed to render all pending claims allowable over the cited art and/or at least place this application in better form for appeal. This Amendment was not earlier presented because Applicant believed that the prior response placed this application in condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in that response. Accordingly, entry of the present Amendment, as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and/or to reduce the number of issues, is requested under 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Applicant: KALISH Dan
Application No.: 10/799,863
Examiner: Kessler M. E.

Petition for extension is herewith made. The extension fee for response within a period of three months pursuant to Section 1.136(a) in accordance with Section 1.17 is enclosed herewith.

No additional fee is believed due. However, please charge any required fee (or credit any overpayments of fees) to the Deposit Account of the undersigned, Account No. 500601 (Docket No. 7044-X04-036).

Respectfully submitted,

/Paul D. Bianco/

Paul D. Bianco, Reg. No. 43,500

Customer Number: 27317

FLEIT GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO
21355 East Dixie Highway
Suite 115
Miami, FL 33180
Tel: 305-830-2600
Fax: 305-830-2605
e-mail: PBianco@fggbb.com